REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 7-16,18-26 and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Yanagi et al., cited previously (Yanagi) and Clark USP 3,568,148. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner has stated that:

> "Clark teaches (see Fig.3) **error correction** comprising one or more decision quality indicators (output of 101, syndrome calculator) of a sequence of decision quality indicators in a window of shift registers (103), wherein the window has a length that is a function of a forward error control code (note col.3, lines 18-22 wherein the length n is dependent on the length of the received code or word). Clark further teaches disabling and enabling of the adaptive processing (note col.7, lines 13-17)." (Emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully points to the Examiner that actually Clark describes the correction method itself using shift registers. According to Clark, the shit register holds the same word as the syndrome calculator 101. The syndrome calculator performs logical manipulation on the word to produce modified syndrome for examination (*see* col. 6, lines 60-63). Clark then uses this syndrome to correct the word in the shift register 103. In contrast, claim 1 recites computing an **error signal**; detecting **transmission errors** over the one or more decision **quality indicators** of the estimates in a window, and updating the adaptive element with the error signal **based on the decision quality indicator dependent value**.

As recited in claim 1, first, an error signal is computed from the estimate of the data symbol; and second, transmission errors are detected over a decision quality indicator. This process actually verifies and validates the computing of errors where in contrast, Clark computes errors over a syndrome and if errors are found, then they are corrected and if no errors are found, then Clark simply uses the data word as the correct word. Clark basically describes what Applicant has identified as problem in the prior art where a system can mistakenly identify reception errors as actual data errors. Claim 1 recites a method that actually allows discrimination between error signals that are believed to be inaccurate due to reception errors, and error signals that are believed to be an accurate measurement of the received signal. Accordingly, claim 1 is clearly and patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references.

Claims 10, 15, 21, and 29 have been rejected in the manner of claim 1. Accordingly, these claims and those depend therefrom are patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Please charge any additional fees, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0668. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

/Abdul Zindani/
Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137